रजिस्टर्ड नं0 HP/13/SML-2008.

राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश

हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य शासन द्वारा प्रकाशित

शिमला, वीरवार, 25 सितम्बर, 2008 / 3 आश्विन, 1930

हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार

LABOUR & EMPLOYMENT DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-02, *the* 18*th September*, 2008

No. Shram (A)6-4/2008(Arbitration).—In exercise of powers vested in him under Sub Section 2 & 3 of Section 10 (A) of the Industrial disputes Act, 1947 and Rules 7, 8 & 9 of Industrial Dispute Rules 1974, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the publication of Arbitration Award on the issue of dispute between "Kol Dam Worker's Union, Kyan, Distt. Mandi and M/ s Italian- Thai Development Public Company Ltd." as given by Shri B.S. Chauhan, Arbitrator Distt. & Session Judge (Retd.) on the website of Labour & Employment Department is as under:—

Before the Arbitrator Sh. B.S. Chouhan, Distt. & Sessions Judges (Retd.)

Award U/s 10-A (4) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

Vide notification number Shram (A) 6-4/2008, dated 11th April, 2008 issued by the Addl. Chief Secretary (Labour & Employment) to the Govt. Of H.P. which was published in Rajpatra dated 16th April, 2008, undersigned was appointed, with the consent of the parties, as an Arbitrator, u/s 10-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to adjudicate the dispute between Koldam Workers Union (CITU) Vs. The Project Manager, M/s Italian- Thai Development Public Company Ltd., hereinafter referred to as Contractor Company, which dispute had arisen on account of termination and retrenchment, allegedly being made by the contractor company in violation of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the rules made there under.

2. Initially, the period fixed for submission of award was 15 days and thereafter, it was further extended by 45 days and finally, it was extended by 10 days more. Now, the time will expire on 27th August, 2008 and this award has to be submitted on or before this date.

3. The brief facts giving rise to this dispute are that NTPC which is a Central Govt. Undertaking and is hereinafter referred to as Employer Company has, under taken the work of Construction of Koldam over River Sutlej at village Kayan, near Slapper, Distt. Mandi (H.P.) and for this purpose is has awarded work of Construction of this dam to various Contractors and one of these contractors is M/s Italian-Thai Development Public Company Ltd. The Koldam workers Union, hereinafter referred to as Union had served demand notices dated 24.10.07, 1.12.07, 22-12-07 & 26-12-07, U/s 2(k) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 on the Contractor Company alleging that services of regular workmen/ employees and workmen on fixed term employment had been retrenched by the contractor company in contravention of the provisions of the Industrial disputes Act, 1947 and the rules made there under. The Management of Contractor Company denied these allegations of the Union. Thereafter, conciliation proceedings were held before the Labour Officer, Mandi and subsequently, before the Joint Labour Commissioner, H.P. in order to settle the dispute amicably. After long deliberations, the parties arrived at an agreement to refer the dispute for voluntary arbitration u/s 10-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and Rules made thereunder and gave consent for appointment of the undersigned as an Arbitrator.

4. The following two issues have been referred to the undersigned for arbitration:

Issue No. 1.

Whether termination of services of regular/ permanent Workmen by giving three months advance notice as per certified standing orders by the Management of M/S Italian –Thai Development Company Ltd. (Contractor Company) without following the procedure of retrenchment as prescribed in Section 25N or 25F and other provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and Rules made there under is legal and justified? If not, what procedure the Management of Contractor Company shall follow to compensate the workers/workmen affected by unlawful action of the Contractor Company and further to complete the Statutory requirements as required under the above said Act and rules ?

Issue No. 2.

Whether termination of services of Employees/Workmen of fixed term employment, by not giving three months advance notice as per certified standing orders by Contractor Company, with following procedure of retrenchment as prescribed under section 25N or 25F and other provisions of Industrial DisputesAct,1947 and Rules made there under is legal and justified? If not, what procedure the Contractor Company shall follow to compensate the fixed term employees/workmen

affected by unlawful action of the above said Contractor Company and further to complete the statutory requirement as required under the above said Act and Rules.

5. The parties have not led any evidence in support of their respective claims and have chosen to address only oral arguments. Accordingly, I have heard the arguments of parties to the dispute and also that of the representative of NTPC, who had also associated in the proceedings and have considered their respective submissions. I have also gone through the relevant provisions of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the Rules made there under and also the relevant provisions of the certified Standing Orders. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter, my findings on the above mentioned two issues are as follows:

FINDINGS

Issue No.1 : No, It amounts to retrenchment and procedure of Sections 25F or 25N of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, as the case may be, shall apply and statutory requirements of these sections must be followed.

Issue No.2 : Yes, Sections 25N or 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 will have no application if termination is made in accordance with terms and conditions of the contract including the stipulation, if any.

REASONS FOR DECISION :

7. **Issues Nos 1 & 2.** Since both these issues are interlinked, the same are being taken up together for discussion and decision. Before taking up the relevant standing order and provisions of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for discussion, it would be essential to explain the legal position and ambit of Standing Orders visa-a-vis the provisions of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. There is no denying the fact that Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is supreme legislation of Labour Laws in India. The Standing Orders are made under-section 3(1) of the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1946 and they are made with the consent of the employer and the workers and these standing orders govern the service conditions of the workers and also the relations between the workers and the employers. These Standing Orders have no statutory force, but, they are binding open the workers and the employer. These orders cannot over-ride and circumvent the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. However these orders shall prevail over the terms and conditions of a contract made by the workers and the employer if the terms and conditions of that contract are contrary to the provisions of these orders.

8. Now, I come to the relevant order which concerns issue no. I supra, It is order 9.1 which provides that employment of a permanent/regular workman may be terminated by giving three months notice in writing or payment of three months wages in lieu of such notice. It is further provided that such notice may either be given by the employer or the workman as per Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. In order to understand the ambit and scope of this order and also the legality, it would be relevant to refer here the provisions of sec. 2 (00) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. It defines “retrenchment”. It provides that retrenchment means the termination by the employer of the service of a workman for any reason whatsoever, otherwise than as a punishment inflicted by way of disciplinary action, but does not include voluntary retirement of the workman or retirement of workman on reaching the age of superannuation, if the contract of employment between employer and the workman concerned contains stipulation in that behalf or termination of the service of a workman as a result of the contract of employment between the employer and the workman concerned on its expiry or of such contract being terminated under a stipulation in that behalf contained therein or termination of the service of a workman on the ground of continued ill-health. It would be significant to mention here that basic element of retrenchment is surplus age. Thus,

retrenchment implies discharge of surplus labour and nonetheless it amounts to termination of service.

9. It would be evident for the aforesaid legal provisions of section 2 (00) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 that every retrenchment is termination, but, converse may not be true. According to this provision, termination can legally take place only in following five cases:

(1) Firstly, as a result of punishment inflicted by way of disciplinary action.
(2) Secondly, on account of voluntary retirement.
(3) Thirdly, on reaching the age of superannuation.
(4) Fourthly, on termination of contact of service.
(5) Fifthly, on the ground of continued ill-health.

Except these five cases, termination shall amount to retrenchment.

10. Manifestly, provisions aforesaid of order 9.1 of the Standing Order are not covered under any of the above mentioned five grounds of termination. This being so, any termination made under the said order shall amount to retrenchment. Therefore, any termination made under order 9.1 supra, must comply with the provisions of section 25F or section 25N as the case may be, of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Both these section deal with retrenchment and they operate in two different fields with two different sets of conditions. However, one thing is common in respect of these sections and that is, one year continuous service which a workman must have put in, in order to take benefit of these sections. It involves concept of 240 days which means that a worker in order to take benefit of law of retrenchment must have actually worked for 240 days during the period of twelve calendar months preceding the date of his termination or retrenchment. However, the contractual employment is not governed by the concept of 240 days. The other conditions for getting benefit of section 25F supra, are that workman concerned must have been employed in industry. After these two conditions are fulfilled, a worker can take benefit of Section 25F. While making termination or retrenchment which attracts Section 25 F, the employer has to issue one month's notice in writing to the worker concerned indicating reasons for retrenchment or in lieu of notice, one month's wages must be paid to him. Apart form this, retrenchment compensation to the extent mentioned in this section has to be paid to the worker concerned and notice has to be served upon the appropriate govt. or the authority specified by the appropriate govt. The employer has also to follow the rule of first come last go mentioned in sec.25G of the Industrial Disputes Act,1947, while making retrenchment, unless cogent and sound reasons are recorded for making departure from the said rule. If the retrenchment of worker is not made in accordance with the provisions of section 25F supra, the same will be illegal and the worker will be entitled to the appropriate relief in accordance with the provisions of Section 25F. However, violation of section 25F does not confer any write to the worker to seek regularization of service. As regards Section 25N supra it applies to a worker of Industrial Establishment and in his case three months notice is required to be issued or wages in lieu of such notice are to be paid. Apart from this, prior, permission of the appropriate govt. or authority, in accordance with the procedure laid down in this section, has to be obtained. The other significant difference between these two sections is that 25F will apply to the worker of an industry which has less than fifty workmen at the relevant time, while section 24N will apply to an industrial establishment which has not less than one hundred workmen employed on an average per working day for the preceding twelve months.

11. Now, if a question arises as to which of these sections would apply to a particular case, it would essentially be a mixed question of facts and law which can be determined only on the basis of evidence of the parties. Thus, no general or readymade formula or yardstick can be worked out for application of the said sections to a particular case because each case will have different facts and circumstances. Moreover, one of the factors of number of workers for determining such

aquestion would always be fluid and fluctuating and determination of this factor will entirely depend upon the evidence of a particular case. Anyhow, in the reference in hand, neither such a question has been specifically referred for arbitration nor the parties have led any evidence in respect of any such question. Therefore, no findings are required to be recorded in respect of such question nor in the absence of any evidence it is possible to do so.

12. Coming to the contract employment, order 3, 3 of the Standing Orders is the relevant rule. It provides that even the workman who has been appointed for fixed term, shall be entitled to all statutory benefits which are available to permanent workman despite the fact that fixed term worker may not have completed the qualifying period of getting such benefits. This provision is quite beneficial and favourable to the workers. But, by no stretch of imagination it can be construed from the language of this order that such contractual worker shall be entitled to the benefit of retrenchment law. This provision simply refers to monetary and other service benefits and nothing more. Therefore, I find no fault with this order and it does not offend any provision of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 nor it gives any right to fixed term worker to challenge his termination under section 25F or 25N of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

13. The law regarding contractual appointment is very clear as mentioned in section 2(00) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 already explained above and with effect from 18.8.1984, sub section(bb)of section 2 (oo)supra, has come in operation by way of amendment which in clear terms provides that neither non-renewal of contract on its expiry nor termination of such contract under stipulation before its expiry, shall amount to retrenchment. Thus, any stipulation in a contract of fixed term employment which enables the employer to terminate the contract before its expiry would be valid and termination as a result of such stipulation would be valid and it would not amount to retrenchment. However, if there is no stipulation and such contract is terminated before its expiry, then the worker or employee shall be entitled to compensation equivalent to amount of wages for the remaining period of his employment. It may thus, be said that section 2 (oo) (bb) which deals with fixed term employment, does not attract the provision of sections 25F or 25N. Therefore, the mischief of both these section has been taken away by the amendment aforesaid of section 2(00) by inducting new provision in sub section (bb) of the said section.

14. In order to support my conclusions aforesaid in respect of both the issues which are subject matter of the reference, in question, I feel it proper to mention here one authority of Hon'ble Supreme Court . This authority is " Uptron India Ltd. Vs Shammi Bhan (1998) 2 LLN 959,965(SC), In which it has been ruled that services of a permanent employee cannot be terminated by giving three month notice or pay in lieu thereof. It is further held that if the Contract is for the fixed term with stipulation that services would be liable for termination on or before expiry of said period, in such a case termination of service either before the expiry of said period, would not amount to retrenchment. Apparently, this authority clinches both the issues in question.

15. The net result of the aforesaid discussion of the relevant provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and Standing Orders , in question ,is that termination permanent/regular worker under Order 9.1 of the Standing Orders by giving three months notice is illegal and it amounts to retrenchment and if prescribed procedure of relevant section of retrenchment is not followed, the worker concerned shall be entitled to the appropriate relief as envisaged under the relevant section of retrenchment Law. However, termination of fixed term worker without three months notice is not illegal. it may be clarified here that a worker who has been retrenched or discharged may again be considered for appointment subject to his suitability, but a worker who has been dismissed may not be eligible for re-employment . Accordingly, both these issues which have been raised in the reference, in question, stand answered. As per terms and conditions of the agreement arrived at in between the parities out of which this reference has arisen, the said agreement comes to an end with

effect from 27th August ,2008 on which date this award has been passed and signed is being submitted to the appropriate govt.

Signed on this day of 27th August, 2008 at Shimla.

Sd/-
(B.S. Chouhan)
Arbitrator,
Distt.& Session judge (Retd.).

By order,
Sd/-
Addl. Chief Secretary (LEP) to the
Government of Himachal Pradesh.

ब अदालत श्री रोहित जमवाल, उप–मण्डल मैजिस्ट्रेट, अर्की, जिला सोलन (हि0 प्र0)

श्री अमन गान्धी पुत्र श्री सत्य प्रकाश गान्धी, निवासी ग्राम बुधार, डाकघर चाखड़, तहसील अर्की, जिला सोलन (हि0 प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता . . प्रतिवादीगण।

विषय.––जन्म तिथि दरूस्ती करने बारे।

प्रार्थी उपरोक्त ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना–पत्र दायर कर रखा है कि उसकी जन्म तिथि स्कूल प्रमाण–पत्र के अनुसार 23–3–1987 जो कि सही है परन्तु पंचायत रिकार्ड में उसकी जन्म तिथि 20–3–1987 दर्ज है जोकि गलत दर्ज है, अब वह ग्राम पंचायत बुधार के अभिलेख में सही जन्म तिथि 23–3–1987 दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः इस इश्तहार राजपत्र हिमाचल प्रदेश द्वारा आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी भी व्यक्ति को इस बारे कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 7–10–2008 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे असालतन हाजिर आकर इस न्यायालय में प्रस्तुत कर सकता है। बाद गुजरने मियाद कोई भी उजर व एतराज समायत न होगा तथा अमन गान्धी पुत्र श्री सत्य प्रकाश गान्धी, निवासी ग्राम बुधार की सही जन्म तिथि दिनांक 23–3–1987 को ग्राम पंचायत बुधार में दर्ज करने के आदेश कर दिया जायेगा।

आज दिनांक 6–9–2008 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

रोहित जमवाल,
उप–मण्डल मैजिस्ट्रेट,
अर्की, जिला सोलन (हि0 प्र0)।

न्यायालय सहायक समाहर्ता, द्वितीय वर्ग अर्की, जिला सोलन (हि0 प्र0)

मिसल नम्बर : 40 / 9–2005.

श्री हरी चन्द पुत्र श्री भुंगर, निवासी काकड़ा, डाकघर दाड़ला, तहसील अर्की, जिला सोलन (हि0 प्र0)।

बनाम

धनी राम आदि

इश्तहार बनाम प्रतिवादीयान

प्रार्थी हरी चन्द ने इस न्यायालय में आवेदन किया है कि उसकी मुशतरका भूमि गांव डुगनिहार, में स्थित है तथा उसकी तकसीम करवाना चाहता है। भूमि खाता खतौनी नम्बर 5 / 7, 6 / 8, 9, 10 खसरा नम्बर 2, 5, 7, 10, 23, 39, 43, 44, 96 / 52, 56, 60, 95 / 52, 6, 8, 9, 11, 40 व 3 कित्ता, 18 रकबा 56–3 बीघा, मौजा डुगनिहार में है। प्रतिवादी श्री अशोक कुमार पुत्र कृष्नी, श्री दिता राम पुत्र श्री हरी राम, श्री सुरेन्द्र कुमार व श्री पवन कुमार पुत्रान श्री रोशन लाल निवासियान मौजा डुगनिहार, श्री विजय पुत्र श्री नन्द लाल, अन्जना पत्नी श्री नील चन्द, निवासियान मौजा कन्सवाला को इस न्यायालय द्वारा समन भेजे गए तथा कुछ की बजरिया चसपानगी तामिल भी करवाई गई है लेकिन वे निश्चित तिथि को न्यायालय में उपस्थित नहीं आये। प्रार्थी ने न्यायालय में आवेदन किया कि उक्त प्रतिवादियान साधारण तरीके से न्यायालय में तलब नहीं किये जा सकते न ही कुछ प्रतिवादियान का सही पता मालूम है। अतः इस इश्तहार द्वारा उक्त प्रतिवादियान को सूचित किया जाता है कि उन्हें इस तकसीम में कोई उजर या एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 4–10–2008 को इस न्यायालय में व्यक्तिगत रूप में या प्राधिकृत प्रतिनिधि या वकालतन हाजिर आकर अपना पक्ष प्रस्तुत कर सकते हैं। उक्त तिथि के पश्चात् कोई उजर या एतराज काबले समायत नहीं होगा तथा उनके विरूद्ध एक पक्षीय कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जायेगी।

आज दिनांक 5–9–2008 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर तथा मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता, द्वितीय वर्ग अर्की,
जिला सोलन (हि0 प्र0)।

————————

ब अदालत श्री आर0 सी0 कटोच, तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील बंगाणा, जिला ऊना (हि0 प्र0)

श्री कपिल देव पुत्र श्री केहर सिंह, निवासी महाल भिण्डला, तहसील बंगाणा, जिला ऊना (हि0 प्र0) . . प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना–पत्र बाबत जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री कपिल देव पुत्र श्री केहर सिंह, निवासी महाल भिण्डला, तहसील बंगाणा, जिला ऊना ने इस न्यायालय में एक प्रार्थना–पत्र पस्तुत किया है कि उसकी पुत्री का नाम अंजली देवी है, जिसकी जन्म तिथि 27–11–2006 है अज्ञानतावश वह अपनी पुत्री की जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत के रिकार्ड में दर्ज न करवा सके हैं, जिसे दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित किए जावें।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इश्तहार मुनादी हिमाचल प्रदेश राजपत्र के माध्यम से सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत के रिकार्ड में दर्ज करने बारे कोई आपत्ति या एतराज हो तो वह निर्धारित तिथि पेशी दिनांक 7–10–2008 को इस न्यायालय में प्रातः 10.00 बजे असालतन या वकालतन उपस्थित आकर अपनी आपत्ति या एतराज प्रस्तुत कर सकता है। हाजिर न आने की सूरत में नियमानुसार कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 5–9–2008 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर। आर0 सी0 कटोच,
तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
तहसील बंगाणा, जिला ऊना (हि0 प्र0)।

————————

ब अदालत श्री आर0 सी0 कटोच, तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम वर्ग, तहसील बंगाणा, जिला ऊना (हि0 प्र0)

श्री ब्रहम दास पुत्र श्री नत्थू राम, निवासी महाल सर ब्राहमणा, तप्पा धनेत, तहसील बंगाणा, जिला ऊना (हि0 प्र0) . . प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना–पत्र बाबत नाम दरुस्ती कागजात माल।

श्री ब्रहम दास पुत्र श्री नत्थू राम, निवासी महाल सर ब्राहमणा, तप्पा धनेत, तहसील बंगाणा, जिला ऊना ने इस न्यायालय में एक प्रार्थना–पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है कि उसका नाम पंचायत रिकार्ड, स्कूल प्रमाण–पत्र व पहचान–पत्र में ब्रहम दास पुत्र श्री नत्थू राम दरुस्त दर्ज है, परन्तु कागजात माल में उसका नाम साधू राम पुत्र श्री नत्थू गलत दर्ज चला आ रहा है। इसलिए उसका नाम कागजात माल में साधू राम की बजाए ब्रहम दास पुत्र श्री नत्थू राम दरुस्त दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित किए जावें।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इश्तहार मुनादी हिमाचल प्रदेश राजपत्र के माध्यम से सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त नाम दरुस्ती बारे कोई आपत्ति या एतराज हो तो वह निर्धारित तिथि पेशी दिनांक 4–10–2008 को इस न्यायालय में प्रातः 10.00 बजे असालतन या वकालतन उपस्थित आकर अपनी आपत्ति या एतराज प्रस्तुत कर सकता है। हाजिर न आने की सूरत में नियमानुसार कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 5–9–2008 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर। आर0 सी0 कटोच,
तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम वर्ग,
तहसील बंगाणा, जिला ऊना (हि0 प्र0)।

————————

ब अदालत श्री आर0 सी0 कटोच, तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील बंगाणा, जिला ऊना (हि0 प्र0)

1. श्री अर्जुन कुमार पुत्र श्री दीना नाथ, निवासी महाल डरोह, तहसील बंगाणा, जिला ऊना (हि0 प्र0)।

2. संजू पुत्री श्री धर्म सेन, निवासी महाल बड़साल, तहसील रोहड़ू, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0)
. . प्रार्थीगण।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना–पत्र अधीन धारा 8 (1) ऑफ अमैडड मैरिज ऐक्ट, 1996 के अन्तर्गत शादी पंजीकरण करने बारे।

उपरोक्त मुकद्दमा में श्री अर्जुन कुमार व श्रीमती संजू पुत्री श्री धर्म सेन ने हिन्दू रीति–रिवाज के अनुसार शादी कर ली है, जिसे संशोधित मैरिज ऐक्ट, 1969 के अन्तर्गत पंजीकृत किया जाना है।

अतः आम जनता एवं उनके रिश्तेदारों को इस इश्तहार मुनादी हिमाचल प्रदेश के माध्यम से सूचित किया जाता है कि उक्त शादी पंजीकरण करने बारे किसी व्यक्ति को कोई आपत्ति या एतराज हो तो वह निर्धारित तिथि पेशी दिनांक 6–10–2008 को इस न्यायालय में प्रातः 10.00 बजे असालतन या वकालतन उपस्थित आकर अपनी आपत्ति या एतराज प्रस्तुत कर सकता है, अन्यथा अनुपस्थिति की अवस्था में नियमानुसार कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 8–9–2008 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

आर0 सी0 कटोच,
तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
तहसील बंगाणा, जिला ऊना (हि0 प्र0)।

नियन्त्रक, मुद्रण तथा लेखन सामग्री, हिमाचल प्रदेश, शिमला–5 द्वारा मुद्रित तथा प्रकाशित